Remarks/Arguments

This response is attached to a Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

In the Office Action dated 12 August 2004, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by an abstract of Japanese Patent Publication 61-099467 to Sony. This reference is discussed in the instant specification on page 1, starting on line 24, and was submitted to the Office, together with an English language translation, on 9 August 2001.

As amended, Claim 1 recites means for generating a control signal coupled to said amplifier for open loop control of said scanning velocity modulation deflection signal in a predetermined range of amplitudes responsive to selected ones of said plurality of scanning frequencies. Nowhere does the cited reference to Sony show or suggest this structure.

In order to obtain a scan velocity modulation (SVM) signal, Sony performs a double differentiation of the video signal. The first differentiation is performed by differentiator 80; the second differentiation is provided by AGC circuit 82. The output of AGC circuit 82 is maintained by a closed-loop feedback path through peak-to-peak value detecting circuit 83. Frequency discriminator 84 produces a DC output which varies the time constant of AGC circuit 82 as a function of deflection frequency. In this way, the period of differentiation by the AC circuit is varied as a function of deflection frequency, so as to vary the SVM signal. The SVM signal is fed to scan-rate modulating terminal G of the fourth grid of the cathode ray tube. Nowhere does Sony teach or suggest a control signal coupled to an amplifier for open loop control of the scanning velocity modulation deflection signal in a predetermined range of amplitudes responsive to selected ones of the plurality of scanning frequencies, as specifically set forth in Claim 1. Rather, Sony's control of the amplitude of AGC circuit 82 is closed loop through peak-to-peak value detecting circuit 83. The open loop control of AGC circuit 82 is merely control of the time

constant of the AGC circuit. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 1 as amended is not affected by the reference to Sony.

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2 and 3.

Claim 4 has been similarly rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by Sony. Nowhere does Sony generate a control signal in accordance with the determined scanning frequency to maintain the scanning velocity modulation signal within a predetermined range of amplitudes substantially independent of the horizontal scanning frequency of the signal coupled for display. Rather, the gain control input of AGC circuit 82 is coupled to the output of AGC circuit 82 through circuit 83. The output of AGC circuit 82 is controlled in closed loop fashion. The time constant input of AGC circuit 82 is fed by frequency discriminator 84, which provides a signal representative of scanning frequency. However, it is to be noted that the signal representative of scanning frequency controls only the time constant of AGC circuit 82. It is therefore clear that Sony does not affect the patentability of Claim 4.

Claims 5, 6 and 8 have been amended to correct the dependency problems pointed out by the Examiner. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 5-8.

Claim 9 has been rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by Sony. The Examiner has asserted that Sony shows a differential amplifier. The Applicants can not agree. Item 82 of Figure 1 of Sony is not a differential amplifier. Rather, it is an AGC circuit having a gain control input and a time constant input. The Examiner is requested to reconsider his assertion that Sony shows a differential amplifier.

The Applicants note that only Claims 1, 4 and 9 have been rejected. Claims 2 and 3 have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Claims 5-8 and 10-14 have been objected to because of dependency problems. Since these dependency problems have been overcome, the Applicants submit that these claims are patentable.

The Applicants submit that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY OWEN ALLENDER ET AL.

Christine Johnson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,507
609-734-6892

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
February 10, 2006